arXiv:1612.09157v1 [math-ph] 29 Dec 2016

The Star Product in Interacting Quantum Field Theory

Eli Hawkins, Kasia Rejzner

Abstract

We provide a direct formula for the interacting star product in perturbative Algebraic Quantum Field Theory. Our expression is non-perturbative in the coupling constant and is well defined on a regular interaction and observables. We also discuss perturbative agreement and perspectives for renormalization.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Kinematical structure **2**
2.1 The space of field configurations . . . 3
2.2 Functionals on the configuration space . . . 3

3 Classical theory **4**
3.1 Dynamics . . . 4
3.2 Classical Møller maps off-shell . . . 6

4 Deformation quantization **8**
4.1 Exponential star products . . . 8
4.2 Time-ordered products . . . 11
4.3 Quantization maps . . . 14

5 Interaction **15**
5.1 The formal S-matrix and Møller operators . . . 15
5.2 Graphical computations . . . 19
5.2.1 Non-interacting product . . . 20
5.2.2 Inverse Møller operator . . . 20
5.2.3 Composition of operators . . . 21
5.2.4 Interacting product . . . 22
5.3 Nonperturbative expression for an interacting product . . . 25
5.3.1 Low order terms . . . 28
5.3.2 Is there a Kontsevich-type formula? . . . 29
5.3.3 Interacting product in the standard identification and renormalization . . . 30
5.4 Perturbative Agreement . . . 33

6 Conclusions 35

1 Introduction

Constructing interacting quantum field theory (QFT) models in 4 dimensions is one of the most important challenges facing modern theoretical physics. Even though there is no final consensus on how the actual axiomatic framework underlying QFT should be formulated, most attempts at construction of models try to fit into one of the established axiomatic systems: Wightman-Gårding [SW00], Haag-Kastler [HK64, Haa93] or Osterwalder-Schrader[OS73]. On the other hand, most computations in QFT are done using less rigorous methods and they often rely on a perturbation theory expansion organized in terms of Feynman graphs. These not only have remarkable agreement with experiments, but recently have gotten a lot of interest from pure mathematicians after the recognition that the combinatorics of Feynman graphs is related to interesting structures relevant in number theory [CK00].

There have also been attempts to combine the advantages of having a mathematically sound axiomatic framework with perturbative methods. One of these approaches, developed in the last two decades, is called perturbative algebraic quantum field theory pAQFT. The foundations were laid in [DF01b, DF02, DF04, DF07, DF01a, BDF09] and further results concerning fermionic fields and gauge theory were obtained in [Rej11, FR12b, FR12a]. For a review see [Rej16].

One of the ingredients of pAQFT is formal deformation quantization — the construction of a *star product* for the algebra of observables. Recently, this star product was constructed in [FR12a] by an indirect method (when restricted to regular functionals). Here we provide a direct formula, which is a non-perturbative expression in the coupling constant (although still formal in $\hbar$). This is the first result of this kind obtained in the framework of pAQFT and it is a major step towards obtaining more general non-perturbative results. Moreover, the result is of interest in its own right, as a generalization of (or rather alternative to) the Kontsevich formula [Kon03]. The detailed comparison of our approach with that of Kontsevich is made in section 5.3.2.

In section 5.3.3 we show how our formula, up to second order in $\hbar$, can be extended from regular to local functionals, which amounts to performing renormalization of Feynman graphs used in our combinatorial expansion. We also discuss potential obstructions for renormalizing the higher orders. We end this paper with a brief discussion of how our methods allow us to streamline the proof of *perturbative agreement* presented in [DHP15].

2 Kinematical structure

In the framework of perturbative algebraic quantum field theory (pAQFT) we start with the classical theory, which is subsequently quantized. We work in the Lagrangian framework, but there are some modifications that we need to make to deal with the infinite dimensional character of field theory. In this section we give an overview of mathematical structures that will be needed later on to construct mod-

els of classical and quantum field theories. Since we do not fix the dynamics yet, the content of this section describes the kinematical structure of our model. Readers familiar with some of the concepts we introduce here can skip corresponding subsections.

2.1 The space of field configurations

We start with a globally hyperbolic spacetime $\mathcal{M} = (M, \mathbf{g})$. Next we introduce $\mathcal{E}$, the space of field configurations. The choice of $\mathcal{E}$ specifies what kind of objects our model describes (e.g. scalar fields, Dirac fields, gauge fields, etc.).

Definition 2.1. The configuration space $\mathcal{E}$ on the fixed spacetime $\mathcal{M} = (M, \mathbf{g})$ is realized as the space of smooth subsections $\Gamma(E)$ of some vector bundle $E \xrightarrow{\pi} M$ over M.

Definition 2.2. The space of compactly supported sections is denoted $\mathcal{E}_c = \Gamma_c(E)$. The space of sections of the dual bundle is denoted $\mathcal{E}^* = \Gamma(E^*)$.

2.2 Functionals on the configuration space

We model classical and quantum observables as smooth (in the sense of Bastiani calculus [Bas64, Ham82, Mil84, Nee06]) functions on $\mathcal{E}$.

By definition $F^{(1)}(\varphi)$, if it exists, is an element of the complexified dual space ${\mathcal{E}'}^{\mathbb{C}} \doteq \mathcal{E}' \otimes \mathbb{C}$. More generally, $F^{(n)}(\varphi)$ induces a continuous map on the completed projective tensor product $\mathcal{E}^{\hat{\otimes}_\pi k} \cong \Gamma(E^{\boxtimes n} \to M^n)$, where $\boxtimes$ is the exterior tensor product of vector bundles. Here we denote the map on $\mathcal{E}^{\hat{\otimes}_\pi k}$ by the same symbol as the original differential, i.e., $F^{(n)}(\varphi)$.

Definition 2.3. The *spacetime support* of a map, F, from $\mathcal{E}$ to some set is defined by

$$\operatorname{supp} F \doteq \{x \in M \mid \forall \text{open } U \ni x \; \exists \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{E}, \operatorname{supp}\psi \subset U, F(\varphi + \psi) \neq F(\varphi)\} \; .$$

Definition 2.4. A functional $F \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{C})$ is called *local* if for each $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists an open neighbourhood V in $\mathcal{E}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\varphi \in V$ we have

$$F(\varphi) = \int_M \alpha(j^k_x(\varphi)) \; , \tag{1}$$

where $j^k_x(\varphi)$ is the k'th jet prolongation of φ and α is a density-valued function on the jet bundle. We denote the space of local functionals by $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$.

We equip the space $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ of local functionals on the configuration space with the pointwise product using the prescription

$$(F \cdot G)(\varphi) \doteq F(\varphi)G(\varphi) \, , \tag{2}$$

where $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$ is not closed under this product, but we can consider instead the space $\mathcal{F}$ of *multilocal functionals*, which is defined as the algebraic closure of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{loc}}$

under the product (2). We can also introduce the involution operator $*$ on $\mathcal{F}$ using complex conjugation, i.e.,

$$F^*(\varphi) \doteq \overline{F(\varphi)}\,.$$

In this way we obtain a commutative $*$-algebra.

Functional derivatives of Bastiani smooth functionals on $\mathcal{E}$ are compactly supported distributions. We can distinguish certain important classes of functionals by analyzing the wavefront (WF) set properties of their derivatives.

Local and multilocal functionals satisfy some important regularity properties. Firstly, for local functionals the wavefront set of $F^{(n)}(\varphi)$ is orthogonal to TD_n, the tangent bundle of the thin diagonal. In particular, $F^{(1)}(\varphi)$ has empty wavefront set, and so is smooth for each fixed $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$. The latter is true also for multilocal functionals, i.e., $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Note that using the metric volume form $\mu_{\mathbf{g}}$ we can therefore identify $F^{(1)}(\varphi)$ with an element of $\mathcal{E}^*_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Definition 2.5. A functional $F \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{C})$ is called *regular* ($F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$) if $F^{(n)}(\varphi)$ has empty WF set for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$.

For a regular functional $F^{(n)}(\varphi)$ can be identified with an element of $\Gamma_c(M^n, (E^*)^{\boxtimes n})^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Definition 2.6. Ξ_n is the open cone defined as

$$\Xi_n \doteq T^*M^n \setminus \{(x_1, \dots, x_n; k_1, \dots, k_n) \mid (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in (\overline{V}^n_+ \cup \overline{V}^n_-)_{(x_1,\dots,x_n)}\}\,, \tag{3}$$

where $(\overline{V}_\pm)_x$ is the closed future/past lightcone understood as a conic subset of T^*_xM. A functional $F \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{E}, \mathbb{R})$ is called *microcausal* if it is compactly supported and satisfies

$$\mathrm{WF}(F^{(n)}(\varphi)) \subset \Xi_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{E}\,. \tag{4}$$

3 Classical theory

3.1 Dynamics

Dynamics is introduced in the Lagrangian framework. We begin with recalling some crucial definitions after [BDF09].

Definition 3.1. A *generalized Lagrangian* on a fixed spacetime $\mathcal{M} = (M, \mathbf{g})$ is a map $L : \mathcal{D}(M) \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ such that

i) $L(f + g + h) = L(f + g) - L(g) + L(g + h)$ for $f, g, h \in \mathcal{D}(M)$ with $\mathrm{supp}\, f \cap \mathrm{supp}\, h = \varnothing$ (Additivity).

ii) $\mathrm{supp}(L(f)) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(f)$ (Support).

iii) Let $\mathrm{Iso}(\mathcal{M})$ be the oriented and time oriented isometry group of the spacetime $\mathcal{M}$. (For Minkowski spacetime $\mathrm{Iso}(\mathcal{M})$ is the proper orthochronous Poincaré group $\mathcal{P}^\uparrow_+$.) We require that $L(f)(u^*\varphi) = L(u_*f)(\varphi)$ for every $u \in \mathrm{Iso}(\mathcal{M})$ (Covariance).

Definition 3.2. An *action* is an equivalence class of Lagangians under the equivalence relation [BDF09]

$$L_1 \sim L_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad \operatorname{supp}((L_1 - L_2)(f)) \subset \operatorname{supp} df\,. \tag{5}$$

The physical meaning of (5) is to identify Lagrangians that "differ by a total divergence".

Definition 3.3. The *Euler-Lagrange derivative* (first variational derivative) of L is a map $L' : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}'_c$ defined by

$$\langle L'(\varphi), h\rangle \doteq \left\langle L(f)^{(1)}[\varphi], h\right\rangle\,,$$

where $h \in \mathcal{E}_c$ and $f \in \mathcal{D}(M)$ is chosen in such a way that $f = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} h$.

Since $L(f)$ is a local functional, L' doesn't depend on the choice of f. Note that two Lagrangians equivalent under the relation (5) induce the same Euler-Lagrange derivative, so dynamics is a structure coming from actions rather than Lagrangians.

Definition 3.4. The Euler-Lagrange derivative of an action, S, is $S' \doteq L'$ for any Lagrangian $L \in S$.

We are now ready to introduce the equations of motion (EOM's).

Definition 3.5. The equation of motion (EOM) corresponding to the action S is

$$S'(\varphi) = 0\,, \tag{6}$$

understood as a condition on $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$.

Remark 3.1. The space of solutions of (6) may be pathological. Instead, in this algebraic setting, we should work with the quotient of $\mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{F}_{\text{reg}}$ by the ideal generated by S'. This plays the *role* of the algebra of functionals on the space of solutions.

However, in this paper we are concerned with "off shell" constructions.

Definition 3.6. The second variational derivative S'' of the action S is defined by

$$\langle S''(\varphi), h_1 \otimes h_2\rangle \doteq \left\langle L^{(2)}(f)(\varphi), h_1 \otimes h_2\right\rangle\,,$$

where $L \in S$ and $f = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} h_1 \cup \operatorname{supp} h_2$.

By definition, $S''(\varphi) : \mathcal{E}_c \times \mathcal{E}_c \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bilinear map, and it induces a continuous linear operator $P_S(\varphi) : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}^*$, where $\mathcal{E}^* \doteq \Gamma(E^* \to M)$. Note that if S is quadratic then $P_S(\varphi) \equiv P$ is the same for all φ and $S'(\varphi) = P\varphi$. This is the case for the free scalar field, where $P = -(\Box + m^2)$.

The crucial assumption in the pAQFT approach is that $P_S(\varphi)$ is a normally hyperbolic operator. For such operators there exist unique retarded and advanced Green's functions (fundamental solutions) $\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_S(\varphi)$, $\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_S(\varphi) : \mathcal{E}^*_c \to \mathcal{E}$ defined by the requirements

$$\begin{aligned} P_S(\varphi) \circ \Delta^{\mathrm{R/A}}_S(\varphi) &= \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{E}^*_c}\,,\\ \Delta^{\mathrm{R/A}}_S(\varphi) \circ P_S(\varphi)\Big|_{\mathcal{E}_c} &= \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{E}_c}\,, \end{aligned}$$

and the support properties

$$\operatorname{supp} \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}(\varphi)(f) \subset J^+(\operatorname{supp} f)\,,$$
$$\operatorname{supp} \Delta_S^{\mathrm{R}}(\varphi)(f) \subset J^-(\operatorname{supp} f)\,,$$

where $f \in \mathcal{E}_c^*$. Note that, by the Schwarz kernel theorem, these operators can be written in terms of their integral kernels, which then satisfy appropriate support properties and

$$\Delta_S^{\mathrm{R}}(\varphi)(y,x) = \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}(\varphi)(x,y)\,. \tag{7}$$

The *causal propagator* as

$$\Delta_S(\varphi) \doteq \Delta_S^{\mathrm{R}}(\varphi) - \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}(\varphi)\,. \tag{8}$$

Due to (7) the causal propagator is antisymmetric, i.e., its integral kernel satisfies

$$\Delta_S(\varphi)(y,x) = -\Delta_S(\varphi)(x,y)\,.$$

We equip $\mathcal{F}$ with a Poisson bracket called the *Peierls bracket* [Pei52].

Definition 3.7. Let $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$. The *Peierls bracket* is defined by

$$\lfloor F, G \rfloor_S(\varphi) \doteq \left\langle \Delta_S(\varphi), F^{(1)}(\varphi) \otimes G^{(1)}(\varphi) \right\rangle\,, \tag{9}$$

where $\Delta_S(\varphi)$ is used as a linear map on the complexification $\mathcal{E}_c^{*\mathbb{C}}$ with values in $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{C}}$.

3.2 Classical Møller maps off-shell

To avoid functional analytic difficulties we define all the structures only for regular functionals $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ or local functionals $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$. We work perturbatively, i.e., we use formal power series in λ, which plays the role of a coupling constant.

On solutions, the retarded and advanced Møller maps $\mathtt{r}_{S+\lambda V,S}, \mathtt{a}_{S+\lambda V,S} : \mathcal{E}_S \to \mathcal{E}_{S+\lambda V}$ are defined by the requirements that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_S$, $\varphi - \mathtt{r}_{S+\lambda V,S}(\varphi)$ has past-compact support and $\varphi - \mathtt{a}_{S+\lambda V,S}(\varphi)$ has future-compact support. We will be using the retarded maps, but everything we say adapts easily to the advanced maps.

Following [DF02], the off-shell retarded Møller map is defined by the conditions

$$\mathtt{r}_{S_1,S_2} \circ \mathtt{r}_{S_2,S_3} = \mathtt{r}_{S_1,S_3} \tag{10}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \mathtt{r}_{S+\lambda V,S}(\varphi)\bigg|_{\lambda=0} = \Delta_S^{\mathrm{R}}(\varphi) V^{(1)}(\varphi)\,. \tag{11}$$

These retarded Møller maps are perturbatively well defined, and restriction to solutions gives the on-shell Møller maps [DF02].

Let S_0 be the free (quadratic) action and $\lambda V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ the perturbation. To simplify the notation we abbreviate $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V} \doteq \mathtt{r}_{S_0+\lambda V,S_0}$.

Møller maps act on functionals by the pullback.

$$(r_{\lambda V} F)(\varphi) \doteq F \circ \mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi)\,, \tag{12}$$

where $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proposition 3.1. *[DF02, Prop. 2] Let $F, G, V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ or $F, G, V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$. The retarded Møller operator $r_{\lambda V}$ preserves the Peierls bracket, i.e.,*

$$\lfloor r_{\lambda V} F, r_{\lambda V} G \rfloor_{S_0} = r_{\lambda V}(\lfloor F, G \rfloor_{S_0 + \lambda V})$$

and the analogous statement for $a_{\lambda V}$.

Lemma 3.1. *The retarded Møller map satisfies the* Yang-Feldmann *equation*

$$\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) = \varphi - \lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi))\,. \tag{13}$$

Conversely, a map satisfying the Yang-Feldmann equation (13) must be the retarded Møller map.

Proof. Using eq. (10) and (11)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\lambda}\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) = \frac{d}{d\mu}\mathtt{r}_{(\lambda+\mu)V}(\varphi)\Big|_{\mu=0} &= \frac{d}{d\mu}\mathtt{r}_{S_0+(\lambda+\mu)V, S_0+\lambda V} \circ \mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi)\Big|_{\mu=0} \\ &= -\Delta^{R}_{S_0+\lambda V} V^{(1)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi))\end{aligned}$$

Apply $P + \lambda V^{(2)}(\varphi)$ (where P is the differential operator induced by S_0'').

$$\left(P + \lambda V^{(2)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi))\right) \frac{d}{d\lambda}\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) = -V^{(1)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi))$$

Apply $\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0}$ (which is independent of φ).

$$\left(\mathrm{id} + \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(2)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi))\right) \frac{d}{d\lambda}\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) = -\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi))$$

Rearranging gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\lambda}\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) &= -\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi)) - \lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(2)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi)) \frac{d}{d\lambda}\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) \\ &= \frac{d}{d\lambda}\left(-\lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi))\right)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathtt{r}_0 = \mathrm{id}$, integrating gives (13).

The Yang-Feldman equation is equivalent to saying that the inverse of the Møller map is

$$\mathtt{r}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) = \varphi + \lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\varphi)\,.$$

This gives $\mathtt{r}^{-1}_{\lambda V}$ as a formal power series in λ. The constant term is just the identity map. Therefore this is invertible as a formal power series. Its inverse is unique, so the Møller map is that unique inverse.

More explicitly, $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) \approx \varphi$ to 0'th order. Applying eq. (13) iteratively improves this approximation, so that $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) \approx \varphi - \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\varphi)$ to first order and the sequence of approximations converges as a formal power series (λ-adically) to $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}$. □

4 Deformation quantization

Starting with the Poisson algebra $(\mathcal{F}_*, \lfloor ., . \rfloor_{S_0})$ (where $\mathcal{F}_* = \mathcal{F}_{\mu c}$ or $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$) formal deformation quantization [BFF+78] means constructing an associative algebra $(\mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]], \star)$, where the product $\star$ is given by a power series

$$F \star G = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hbar^n B_n(F, G)\,, \tag{14}$$

in which each B_n is a bidifferential operator (in the sense of calculus on $\mathcal{E}$) and in particular

$$\begin{aligned} B_0(F, G) &= F \cdot G\,, \\ B_1(F, G) - B_1(G, F) &= i \lfloor F, G \rfloor_{S_0}\,. \end{aligned}$$

4.1 Exponential star products

The Peierls bracket of a quadratic action such as S_0 is a constant bidifferential operator, in the sense that it does not depend on φ. Some of the $\star$-products that we need to consider are simple in a similar way.

Let $\mathcal{F}_*$ denote the space of functionals satisfying an appropriate tower of WF set conditions for the functional derivatives (for example take $* = \mu c$ or $* = \mathrm{reg}$) and let $\mathcal{F}_*^2$ be the obvious generalization to functionals of two variables.

Let $m : \mathcal{F}_* \otimes \mathcal{F}_* \to \mathcal{F}_*$ denote the pointwise product, i.e. pullback by the diagonal map; in this notation, $F \cdot G = m(F \otimes G)$.

The space $\mathcal{F}_*^2$ has to be defined in such a way that m extends to a map from $\mathcal{F}_*^2$ to $\mathcal{F}_*$ and $\mathcal{F}_* \otimes \mathcal{F}_* \subset \mathcal{F}_*^2$.

Suppose $K \in \Gamma_c'^{\,\mathbb{C}}(E^{*\boxtimes 2} \to M^2)$ is such that D, defined by

$$D \doteq \left\langle K, \tfrac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi_1 \delta\varphi_2} \right\rangle\,,$$

is a map $\mathcal{F}_*^2 \to \mathcal{F}_*^2$. Note that on tensor products

$$[D(F \otimes G)](\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \doteq \left\langle K, F^{(1)}(\varphi_1) \otimes G^{(1)}(\varphi_2) \right\rangle\,. \tag{15}$$

Remark 4.1. Note the nontrivial compatibility condition between the choice of $\mathcal{F}_*$ and the singularity structure of K.

Definition 4.1. The *exponential product* given by K on $\mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]]$ is defined by

$$F \star G \doteq m \circ e^{\hbar D}(F \otimes G)\,. \tag{16}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Any exponential product, $\star$, is associative.*

This is proven in [Kel10, Prop. II.4]. This is a simple generalization of the finite rank case originally proven in [Ger68, Thm. 8]. See also [MMOY07, Wal07].

The involution * (given by complex conjugation) extends to $\mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]]$ if we just let $\hbar^* = \hbar$. However, this is an antiautomorphism of $\star$ if and only if $K(y, x) = \overline{K(x, y)}$.

In terms of eq. (14), if we expand (16) in powers of $\hbar$, then the first term is just $B_0 = m$, and the second term is $B_1 = m \circ D$, i.e.,

$$B_1(F,G)(\varphi) = \left\langle K, F^{(1)}(\varphi) \otimes G^{(1)}(\varphi) \right\rangle \,.$$

From this, we can see that $\star$ gives a deformation quantization with respect to the S_0 Peierls bracket iff

$$K(x,y) - K(y,x) = i\Delta_{S_0}(x,y)\,. \tag{17}$$

So, only the antisymmetric part of K is relevant to compatibility with the Peierls bracket.

Definition 4.2. Given a bidistribution, $Y \in {\Gamma'_c}^{\mathbb{C}}(E^{*\boxtimes 2} \to M^2)$, let $\mathcal{D}_Y \doteq \left\langle Y, \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi^2} \right\rangle$ and $\alpha_Y \doteq e^{\frac{\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_Y}$.

Proposition 4.2. *Consider $K_1, K_2 \in {\Gamma'_c}^{\mathbb{C}}(E^{*\boxtimes 2} \to M^2)$, whose difference, $Y \doteq K_2 - K_1$ is symmetric, and which determine products $\star_1$ and $\star_2$. If $\mathcal{F}_*$ is in the domain of all powers of $\mathcal{D}_Y$, then*

$$\alpha_Y : (\mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]], \star_1) \to (\mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]], \star_2)$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. Firstly, the hypothesis that $\mathcal{F}_*$ is in the domain of all powers of $\mathcal{D}_Y$ means that $\alpha_Y : \mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]] \to \mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]]$ is well defined.

Because of the symmetry of Y, applying $\mathcal{D}_Y$ to a product gives

$$\mathcal{D}_Y(FG) = \mathcal{D}_Y(F)G + F\mathcal{D}_Y(G) + 2m \circ (D_2 - D_1)(F \otimes G)\,.$$

More concisely,

$$\mathcal{D}_Y \circ m = m \circ (\mathcal{D}_Y \otimes \mathrm{id} + \mathrm{id} \otimes \mathcal{D}_Y + 2D_2 - 2D_1)\,.$$

In other words, m intertwines those two operators. This implies that it intertwines their powers and their exponentials, therefore

$$\alpha_Y \circ m = m \circ e^{\hbar(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}_Y \otimes \mathrm{id} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{id} \otimes \mathcal{D}_Y + D_2 - D_1)}$$

Since the various differential operators commute. Composing this identity on the right with $e^{\hbar D_1}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_Y \circ m \circ e^{\hbar D_1} &= \alpha_Y \circ m_1 \\ &= m \circ e^{\hbar(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}_Y \otimes \mathrm{id} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{id} \otimes \mathcal{D}_Y + D_2)} = m_2 \circ (\alpha_Y \otimes \alpha_Y)\,. \end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\alpha_Y : (\mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]], \star_1) \to (\mathcal{F}_*[[\hbar]], \star_2)$$

is a homomorphism. Finally, α_Y is a formal power series with leading term the identity map, therefore it is invertible and hence an isomorphism. □

Remark 4.2. In the finite-dimensional setting, a proof of this result was given in [MMOY07], although it may have been known well before then. In the context of quantum field theory, it was discussed in [BDF09].

This shows that only the antisymmetric part of K really matters, which suggests that the simplest choice is to take K to be antisymmetric. In that case, eq. (17) requires that $K = \frac{i}{2}\Delta_{S_0}$.

Definition 4.3. The *Moyal-Weyl product* (denoted $\star_0$) is the exponential product defined on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$ by $\frac{i}{2}\Delta_{S_0}$.

Unfortunately, this $\star_0$ does not extend to a larger space of functionals than $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$. This is the fault of Δ_{S_0}, whose wavefront set is

$$\mathrm{WF}(\Delta^+_{S_0}) = \{(x,k;x,-k') \in \dot{T}^*M^2 \mid (x,k) \sim (x',k'), k \in \overline{V}_x\}\,. \tag{18}$$

The problem is that $\overline{V}_x + \overline{V}_x$ is the entire cotangent space at x. This means that the second order term of $\star_0$ is only well defined on regular functionals. We can obtain a better behaved star product by a choice of K that has a smaller WF set. Specifically, we want it to be the half of $\mathrm{WF}(\Delta^+_{S_0})$ with k future-pointing, i.e., $k \in (\overline{V}_+)_x$. This is better, because sums of future-pointing vectors are always future-pointing, and do not give the entire cotangent space. This leaves room for $F^{(n)}$ and $G^{(n)}$ to have nontrivial WF sets but still give a well-defined star product of F and G.

With this in mind, as shown in [Rad96], there exists a real, symmetric, distributional bisolution to the field equation, H, such that

$$\Delta^+_{S_0} \doteq \tfrac{i}{2}\Delta_{S_0} + H \tag{19}$$

has WF set

$$\mathrm{WF}(\Delta^+_{S_0}) = \{(x,k;x,-k') \in \dot{T}^*M^2 \mid (x,k) \sim (x',k'), k \in (\overline{V}_+)_x\}\,. \tag{20}$$

Definition 4.4. Such an H is a *Hadamard distribution*. Given a Hadamard distribution, the *Wick* product (denoted $\star_H$) is the exponential product on $\mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}}[[\hbar]]$ given by $\Delta^+_{S_0}$.

This gives a deformation quantization of $\mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}}$ with respect to the Peierls bracket [BDF09] with * as an involution. By Prop. 4.2,

$$\alpha_H : (\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]], \star_0) \to (\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]], \star_H)$$

is an isomorphism.

This H is far from unique. It is only determined up to the addition of any smooth real symmetric function. Prop. 4.2 shows that the products given by any two choices are equivalent.

4.2 Time-ordered products

We first consider time-ordered products of regular functionals, to understand the algebraic structure. We want the time ordered product $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}$ to be a binary operation on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$ that satisfies the condition

$$F \cdot_{\mathcal{T}} G = \begin{cases} F \star_0 G & \text{if } \operatorname{supp} G \prec \operatorname{supp} F\,, \\ G \star_0 F & \text{if } \operatorname{supp} F \prec \operatorname{supp} G\,, \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

where the relation "$\prec$" means "not later than" i.e., $\operatorname{supp} G \prec \operatorname{supp} F$ means that there exists a Cauchy surface to the future of $\operatorname{supp} G$ and to the past of $\operatorname{supp} F$.

We will assume that $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}$ is defined as

$$F \cdot_{\mathcal{T}} G \doteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}^{-1}F \cdot \mathcal{T}^{-1}G)\,,$$

where

- $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]] \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$ is a differential operator,
- $\mathcal{T} = \mathrm{id} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar)$,
- $\mathcal{T}F = F$ for F linear,
- and $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{T}F$ is contained in the causal completion of $\operatorname{supp} F$.[1]

Theorem 4.1. *Any two operators $\mathcal{T}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfying these conditions (and defining products satisfying eq. (21)) are related by*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T} \circ e^X$$

where

$$XF(\varphi) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left\langle a_n(\varphi), F^{(n)}(\varphi) \right\rangle\,,$$

with $a_n(\varphi)$ a formal power series with coefficients in symmetric distributions supported on the thin diagonal of M^n and depending at most linearly on φ, and $a_n(\varphi)$ is a multiple of $\hbar$.

Proof. First, define $X = \log(\mathcal{T}^{-1} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{T}})$. Because $\mathcal{T}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ are differential, X must be differential. This means that it can be written in the form

$$XF(\varphi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\langle a_n(\varphi), F^{(n)}(\varphi) \right\rangle\,,$$

where a_n is valued in formal power series of symmetric distributions. If F is any linear functional, then $\mathcal{T}F = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}F = F$, so $XF = 0$, therefore $a_0 = a_1 = 0$.

[1] A more elegant way to formulate this condition is to require $\mathcal{T}$ to be natural in the following sense. Consider the category of bounded causally convex subsets of M with inclusions as morphisms. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ be the functor from this category to the category of vector spaces, which assigns to $\mathcal{O} \subset M$ the space of regular functionals supported in $\mathcal{O}$. Then $\mathcal{T}$ is required to be a natural transformation from $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ to itself and this implies in particular the support property.

The ratio $\mathcal{T}^{-1} \circ \tilde{\mathcal{T}} = e^X$ is almost a homomorphism of the pointwise product in the sense that if F and G have causally separated support ($\operatorname{supp} G \prec \operatorname{supp} F$ or $\operatorname{supp} F \prec \operatorname{supp} G$) then

$$e^X(F \cdot G) = (e^X F) \cdot (e^X G)\,.$$

Consequently, X is almost a derivation in the sense that if F and G have causally separated support, then

$$X(F \cdot G) = XF \cdot G + F \cdot XG\,. \tag{22}$$

Any finite set of distinct points of M can be placed in an order consistent with the causal partial order, and there is a time slicing of $\mathcal{M}$ (into Cauchy surfaces) consistent with this order. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in M$ be such a list of points. There exist neighborhoods of these points that are causally separated by Cauchy surfaces of this time slicing. Consider any $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in \mathcal{E}_c^*$ supported on these respective neighborhoods, and any $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{E}$. Define linear functionals

$$F_i(\varphi) = \langle \varphi - \varphi_0, p_i \rangle\ .$$

For any numbers $m_1, \ldots, m_n \in \mathbb{N}$, apply X to the product $F_1^{m_1} \ldots F_n^{m_n}$ and use eq. (22). Evaluating at φ_0, this shows that

$$0 = \left\langle a_{m_1+\cdots+m_n}(\varphi_0), p_1^{\otimes m_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes p_n^{\otimes m_n} \right\rangle\ .$$

Because the section p_i can take any values around x_i, this shows that $a_{m_1+\cdots+m_n}(\varphi_0)$ is not supported at

$$(\underbrace{x_1, \ldots, x_1}_{m_1}, \ldots, \underbrace{x_n, \ldots, x_n}_{m_n})\,.$$

Up to symmetry, this is any point outside the thin diagonal.

Finally, consider a point $x \in M$. If F is supported on a causally complete neighborhood $U \ni x$, then

$$\left\langle a_n(\varphi), F^{(n)}(\varphi) \right\rangle$$

must be supported on U. Take F homogeneous of degree n, so that $F^{(n)}(\varphi) = f \in \Gamma_c(M^n, (E^*)^{\boxtimes n})^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\operatorname{supp} f \subset U^n$. Now consider $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\operatorname{supp} \psi \cap U = \varnothing$. Since $\mathcal{T}F$ has to be supported in U, we conclude that

$$\langle a_n(\varphi) - a_n(\varphi + \psi), f \rangle = 0\,.$$

We can now use this fact to conclude that the derivative $a_n^{(1)}(\varphi)$, seen as a distribution on M^{n+1}, has to be supported on the diagonal. Since X maps regular functionals to regular functionals, this implies that $a_n(\varphi)$ can depend at most linearly on φ. □

There is a physically motivated choice of $\mathcal{T}$ given in terms of the Dirac propagator, $\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{D}} \doteq \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{R}} + \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}})$. Set

$$\mathcal{T} \doteq \alpha_{i\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{D}}} = e^{\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}}\,, \tag{23}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}} = \left\langle \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{D}}, \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi^2} \right\rangle$.

Proposition 4.3. *The time-ordered product $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}$ defined in terms of $\mathcal{T}$ is the exponential product in the sense of definition 4.1 defined by $K = i\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{S_0}$.*

Proof. The Leibniz rule for differentiation implies that

$$\mathcal{D}_K \circ m = m \circ (\mathcal{D}_K \otimes \mathrm{id} + \mathrm{id} \otimes \mathcal{D}_K + 2D_K)\,,$$

which is in fact a co-product structure. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}^{-1}F \cdot \mathcal{T}^{-1}G) &= e^{\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}} \circ m \left(-^{\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}} F \otimes -^{\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}} G\right) \\ &= m \circ e^{\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}\otimes\mathrm{id}+\mathrm{id}\otimes\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}+i\hbar D_{\mathrm{D}}} \left(-^{\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}} F \otimes -^{\frac{i\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{D}}} G\right) \\ &= m \circ e^{i\hbar D_{\mathrm{D}}}(F \otimes G)\,.\end{aligned}$$

□

Because both $\star_0$ and $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}$ are exponential products, they are related by an exponential factor. With obvious notation, $D_\Delta = D_{\mathrm{R}} - D_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $D_{\mathrm{D}} = \frac{1}{2}(D_{\mathrm{R}} + D_{\mathrm{A}})$, so $\frac{1}{2}D_\Delta - D_{\mathrm{D}} = -D_{\mathrm{A}}$, and therefore the relation is

$$m_{\star_0} = m_{\mathcal{T}} \circ e^{-i\hbar D_{\mathrm{A}}}\,. \tag{24}$$

From this relation, it is easy to see why $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies eq. (21). Consider the case that $\operatorname{supp} G \prec \operatorname{supp} F$. By definition, $\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}(x,y) = 0$ when $x \not\preceq y$, so $D_{\mathrm{A}}(F \otimes G) = 0$ and

$$F \star_0 G = m_{\mathcal{T}} \circ e^{-i\hbar D_{\mathrm{A}}}(F \otimes G) = m_{\mathcal{T}}(F \otimes G) = F \cdot_{\mathcal{T}} G\,.$$

Given a choice of Hadamard distribution, H, the Feynman propagator is defined as $\Delta^{\mathrm{F}}_{S_0} = i\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{S_0} + H$. There is another time-ordered product, $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}_H}$, which is the exponential product on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$ given by $\Delta^{\mathrm{F}}_{S_0}$. Again, this is commutative and equivalent to the pointwise product by the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{T}_H \doteq \alpha_{\Delta^{\mathrm{F}}_{S_0}}\,.$$

Because $\Delta^{+}_{S_0} - \Delta^{\mathrm{F}}_{S_0} = -i\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}$,

$$m_{\star_H} = m_{\mathcal{T}_H} \circ e^{-i\hbar D_{\mathrm{A}}}\,.$$

Note that this is exactly the same as the relation between $\star_0$ and $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}$; consequently, by identical reasoning, they are also related by eq. (21), and we can say that $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}_H}$ is the time-ordered product associated to $\star_H$.

Unfortunately, although $\star_H$ is defined on $\mathcal{F}_{\mu c}[[\hbar]]$, this construction only defines $\cdot_{\mathcal{T}_H}$ and $\mathcal{T}_H$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$. Renormalization in pAQFT is a matter of extending these consistently to some local functionals. There is freedom (renormalization ambiguity) in this.

Product	Symbol	Distribution
Pointwise	$\cdot$	0
Weyl	$\star_0$	$\frac{i}{2}\Delta_{S_0} = \frac{i}{2}\left(\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} - \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}\right)$
Time ordered	$\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}$	$i\Delta^{\mathrm{D}}_{S_0} = \frac{i}{2}\left(\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} + \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}\right)$
Wick	$\star_H$	$\Delta^{+}_{S_0} = \frac{i}{2}\left(\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} - \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}\right) + H$
Time ordered	$\cdot_{\mathcal{T}_H}$	$\Delta^{\mathrm{F}}_{S_0} = \frac{i}{2}\left(\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} + \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}\right) + H$
	$\star_{\mathcal{T}}$	$-i\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}$

Table 1: Some of the exponential products, and the distributions used to construct them.

4.3 Quantization maps

If we consider two choices of Hadamard distribution, H and H', then Proposition 4.2 gives an isomorphism $\alpha_{H'-H}$ between the deformation quantizations. These are coherent in the sense that $\alpha_{H''-H'} \circ \alpha_{H'-H} = \alpha_{H''-H}$. This means that we can think of just one abstract algebra[2], $\mathfrak{A}$. The different star products come from different ways of identifying the underlying vector space of $\mathfrak{A}$ with $\mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}}[[\hbar]]$.

Here are some key features of $\mathfrak{A}$:

- $\mathfrak{A}$ is a free module of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$.
- There is a surjective homomorphism $\mathcal{P} : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}}$.
- $\ker \mathcal{P} = \hbar\,\mathfrak{A}$.

Definition 4.5. A *quantization map* is a linear map $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{F}_* \to \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{Q} = \mathrm{id}$.

A quantization map $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}} \to \mathfrak{A}$ extends to an isomorphism of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ modules $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}}[[\hbar]] \to \mathfrak{A}$, which induces a star product by

$$\mathcal{Q}(F \star G) = \mathcal{Q}(F)\mathcal{Q}(G)\,. \tag{25}$$

The compatibility with $\mathcal{P}$ ensures that the star product reduces to the pointwise product modulo $\hbar$. In physics terms, a quantization map is a choice of operator ordering.

Remark 4.3. In a less formal version, $\mathcal{Q}$ would be a map from an algebra of bounded classical observables to the algebra of sections of a continuous field of C*-algebras. This can still induce a star product, but eq. (25) needs to become an asymptotic expansion.

In analogy to (21) we define the time-ordered version of the non-commutative product on $\mathfrak{A}$ as

$$A \mathbin{\mathcal{T}} B = \begin{cases} AB & \text{if } \operatorname{supp} B \prec \operatorname{supp} A\,, \\ BA & \text{if } \operatorname{supp} A \prec \operatorname{supp} B\,, \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

[2]Our point of view differs slightly from the one taken in [BDF09]. In the latter work, $\mathfrak{A}$ denotes a particular realization of our abstract algebra, obtained by completion of the space $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$, $\mathfrak{A}$.

The exponential product $\star_H$ is also induced by a quantization map, $\mathcal{Q}_H$. Complex conjugation is an involution for $\star_H$ because $\mathcal{Q}_H$ is *-linear.

This can also be done for the dense subalgebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}}$ and a subalgebra $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}} \subset \mathfrak{A}$. In this way, there is a quantization map, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{Weyl}} : \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}} \to \mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, that produces the Moyal-Weyl product, $\star_0$. The quantization maps are related by $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{Weyl}} = \mathcal{Q}_H \circ \alpha_H$.

Because these quantization maps are bijective, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ induces a commutative "pointwise" product on $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_H$ induces one on $\mathfrak{A}$.

If $\Delta^+_{S_0}$ is the 2-point function of some choice of "vacuum" state, then $\mathcal{Q}_H$ is the corresponding normal-ordering map. The commutative product induced by $\mathcal{Q}_H$ is the normal-ordered (Wick) product. Of course, this depends upon a choice of H.

The time-ordered product is a more natural commutative product. The time ordered product on $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ is induced by the quantization map

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}} \doteq \mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{Weyl}} \circ \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{Q}_H \circ \mathcal{T}_H \,.$$

The choice of $\mathcal{T}$ fixes the freedom in defining the product $\circledcirc$ as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}} F \circledcirc \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}} G = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(F \cdot G) \,,$$

where $F, G \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$.

We denote by $\star_{\mathcal{T}}$ the star product induced by $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}$; this is given by the multiplication map

$$m \circ e^{-i\hbar D_A} \,.$$

The disadvantages of $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}$ are that it does not extend naturally to $\mathcal{F}_{\mu\mathrm{c}}$ and it is not *-linear.

This is related to the other star products by $F \star_0 G = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}^{-1}F \star_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}^{-1}G)$ and $F \star_H G = \mathcal{T}_H(\mathcal{T}_H^{-1}F \star_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{T}_H^{-1}G)$.

5 Interaction

5.1 The formal S-matrix and Møller operators

Consider a theory with action $S = S_0 + \lambda V$, where $V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ and λ is the coupling constant, treated from now on as a formal parameter (similarly to $\hbar$).

Definition 5.1. The *formal S-matrix* is the map $\mathcal{S} : \lambda\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\lambda]] \to \mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\lambda/\hbar]]$ given by the time-ordered exponential

$$\mathcal{S}(A) = e^{iA/\hbar}_{\circledcirc} = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}\big(e^{i(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}A)/\hbar}\big) \,. \tag{27}$$

Remark 5.1. Here V plays the role of an interaction term where some infrared (IR) and ultraviolet (UV) regularisations have been implemented. The former guarantees compact support and the later regularity. An example regular functional is $\varphi \mapsto \int f(x_1, \ldots, x_4)\varphi(x_1)\ldots\varphi(x_4)$, where f is a compactly supported density on M^4 and $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$. The physical interaction is recovered in the limit $f \to \delta(x_1 - x_1)\ldots\delta(x_1 - x_4)d^4x$. Instead of taking this limit directly, in pAQFT one proceeds

in two steps. First the map $\mathcal{S}$ is extended to a larger subset of $\mathfrak{A}[[\hbar]]$, to deal with the potential UV divergences (see for example [BDF09] and [Rej16] for a review). Next, one takes *the algebraic adiabatic limit* to deal with the IR problem. For more details see [FR15, Rej16] and [Haw16] for an alternative formulation.

The quantum Moller operator is defined by the Bogoliubov formula, which reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_A(B) &= -i\hbar\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mathcal{S}(A)^{-1}\mathcal{S}(A+tB)\right)\Big|_{t=0}\\ &= \left(\mathcal{S}(A)\right)^{-1}\left(\mathcal{S}(A)\circledcirc B\right)\\ &= \left(e_{\circledcirc}^{iA/\hbar}\right)^{-1}\left(e_{\circledcirc}^{iA/\hbar}\circledcirc B\right)\,.\end{aligned}$$

It appears from this formula that $\mathcal{R}_A : \mathfrak{A}_{\rm reg} \to \mathfrak{A}_{\rm reg}[[\lambda/\hbar]]$, but we will show below that $\mathcal{R}_A : \mathfrak{A}_{\rm reg} \to \mathfrak{A}_{\rm reg}[[\lambda]]$. For the interaction $V \in \mathcal{F}_{\rm reg}$, we choose $A = \lambda\, \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)$ in this formula.

The interacting product $\bullet_{\rm int}$ on $\mathfrak{A}_{\rm reg}$ is then defined by

$$A \bullet_{\rm int} B \doteq \mathcal{R}^{-1}_{\lambda\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)}\left(\mathcal{R}_{\lambda\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)}(A)\mathcal{R}_{\lambda\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)}(B)\right)\,.$$

For the purpose of practical computations, it is easier to work with functionals rather than the abstract algebra $\mathfrak{A}_{\rm reg}$, so we should identify $\mathfrak{A}_{\rm reg}$ with $\mathcal{F}_{\rm reg}[[\hbar]]$ by using a quantization map, but there are several to choose from.

The most obvious way to work is based on the quantization map $\mathcal{Q}_{\rm Weyl}$. With this identification, the formal S-matrix becomes $\mathcal{S}_0 \doteq \mathcal{Q}^{-1}_{\rm Weyl}\circ\mathcal{S}\circ\mathcal{Q}_{\rm Weyl}$, so we will be interested in

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\lambda\,\mathcal{T}V) = \mathcal{T}(e^{i\lambda V/\hbar}) \equiv e_{\mathcal{T}}^{i\lambda\mathcal{T}V/\hbar}\,.$$

The Møller operator becomes $R_{\lambda V} \doteq \mathcal{Q}^{-1}_{\rm Weyl}\circ\mathcal{R}_{\lambda\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)}\circ\mathcal{Q}_{\rm Weyl}$, which is

$$R_{\lambda V}(F) = \left(e_{\mathcal{T}}^{i\lambda\,\mathcal{T}V/\hbar}\right)^{\star_0-1}\star_0\left(e_{\mathcal{T}}^{i\lambda\,\mathcal{T}V/\hbar}\cdot_{\mathcal{T}}F\right)\,. \tag{28}$$

If we instead use $\mathcal{Q}_H$, then the formulas are the same, but with $\star_H$ and $\mathcal{T}_H$.

These formulas are difficult to work with, because they each use two different products, neither of which is the natural pointwise product on the space of functionals.

Instead, the most convenient quantization map for computations is actually $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}$. With this identification, the formal S-matrix becomes simply

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}\circ\mathcal{S}\circ\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(F) = e^{iF/\hbar}\,.$$

The Møller operator becomes $\bar{R}_{\lambda V} \doteq \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}\circ\mathcal{R}_{\lambda\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)}\circ\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}$, which is

$$\bar{R}_{\lambda V}(F) = \left(e^{i\lambda V/\hbar}\right)^{\star_{\mathcal{T}}-1}\star_{\mathcal{T}}\left(e^{i\lambda V/\hbar}\cdot F\right)\,.$$

The inverse of this is particularly simple:

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G) \doteq e^{-i\lambda V/\hbar}\left(e^{i\lambda V/\hbar}\star_{\mathcal{T}} G\right)\,.$$

Note that any formula for $\bar{R}_{\lambda V}$ can be converted to a formula for $R_{\lambda V}$ (and *vice versa*) by $R_{\lambda V} \circ \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T} \circ \bar{R}_{\lambda V}$.

Next, note that the symmetric tensor algebra $S\mathcal{E}$ is the universal enveloping algebra of the abelian Lie algebra $\mathcal{E}$. This acts by differential operators on functionals, and we denote this action as $\triangleright$. This extends to formal power series in λ and $\hbar$.

Proposition 5.1.

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)(\varphi) = \left(J(\varphi) \triangleright G\right)(\varphi)$$

where

$$J(\varphi; w) \doteq \exp\left(\lambda \frac{V(\varphi - i\hbar \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w) - V(\varphi)}{-i\hbar}\right) \tag{29}$$

for $w \in \mathcal{E}'$.

Proof. First, for some arbitrary functional F, consider $F \star_{\mathcal{T}}$ as an operator acting on G:

$$\begin{aligned}(F \star_{\mathcal{T}} G)(\varphi) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-i\hbar)^n}{n!} \left\langle F^{(n)}(\varphi), (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0})^{\otimes n} G^{(n)}(\varphi) \right\rangle \\ &= \left(K(\varphi) \triangleright G\right)(\varphi)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$K(\varphi; w) \doteq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-i\hbar)^n}{n!} \left\langle F^{(n)}(\varphi), (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)^n \right\rangle = F(\varphi - i\hbar \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)\,.$$

For $F = e^{i\lambda V/\hbar}$, this becomes

$$K(\varphi; w) = \exp\left(\lambda \frac{V(\varphi - i\hbar \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)}{-i\hbar}\right) = e^{i\lambda V(\varphi)/\hbar} J(\varphi; w)\,,$$

and so

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)(\varphi) = e^{-i\lambda V(\varphi)/\hbar} \left(K(\varphi) \triangleright G\right)(\varphi) = \left(J(\varphi) \triangleright G\right)(\varphi)\,. \qquad \square$$

The original proof of the next result is due to [DF01a] and was presented for the case of local functionals. Here we are working only with regular functionals, which allows a simpler proof.

Corollary 5.1. $\mathcal{R}_A : \mathfrak{A}[[\lambda]] \to \mathfrak{A}[[\lambda]]$ *and* $R_{\lambda V}, \bar{R}_{\lambda V} : \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar, \lambda]] \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar, \lambda]]$. *That is, the Møller operator contains no negative powers of* $\hbar$.

Proof. In the expression

$$\frac{V(\varphi - i\hbar \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w) - V(\varphi)}{-i\hbar}\,,$$

the numerator is of order $\hbar$, so this cancels the $\hbar$ in the denominator, thus J does not contain any negative powers of $\hbar$. This means that $\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V} : \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar, \lambda]] \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar, \lambda]]$.

The fact that $J \approx 1$ to 0'th order in λ means that $\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}$ is a formal power series with the identity map in leading order. As a formal power series, it can thus be inverted, and $\bar{R}_{\lambda V}$ exists. Finally, the other forms of the Møller operator are equivalent to this one. $\square$

Let us now discuss the classical limit. Recall that $\mathcal{P} : \mathfrak{A} \to \mathcal{F}_{\mu c}, \mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}} \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ is the evaluation at the classical limit; it corresponds to setting $\hbar = 0$.

Proposition 5.2. *The classical limit of the quantum Møller operator is the classical Møller operator:*

$$\mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{R}_{\lambda \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)} = r_{\lambda V} \circ \mathcal{P} \,.$$

Equivalently, for $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$,

$$R_{\lambda V}(F)\big|_{\hbar=0} = r_{\lambda V}(F) \,.$$

Proof. Again, it is easiest to prove the equivalent statement for $\bar{R}_{\lambda V}$.

To 0'th order in $\hbar$,

$$\frac{V(\varphi - i\hbar \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w) - V(\varphi)}{-i\hbar} \approx \left\langle V^{(1)}(\varphi), \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w \right\rangle \,,$$

so

$$J(\varphi; w) \approx J_0(\varphi; w) \doteq \exp\left(\lambda \left\langle V^{(1)}(\varphi), \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w \right\rangle\right) \,.$$

Also note that $\mathcal{T}$ is the identity operator to 0'th order in $\hbar$, so $R_{\lambda V} \approx \bar{R}_{\lambda V}$.

Denote

$$\tilde{r}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G) \doteq R^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)\Big|_{\hbar=0} = \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)\Big|_{\hbar=0} = \mathcal{P} \circ \mathcal{R}_{\lambda \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(V)} \circ \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(G) \,.$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{r}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)(\varphi) &= (J_0(\varphi) \triangleright G)(\varphi) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \left\langle \left(V^{(1)}(\varphi)\right)^n, (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0})^{\otimes n} G^{(n)}(\varphi) \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left\langle \left(\lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\varphi)\right)^n, G^{(n)}(\varphi) \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

This is just a Taylor series expansion, so

$$\tilde{r}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)(\varphi) = G\left(\varphi + \lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\varphi)\right) \,.$$

In other words, $\tilde{r}^{-1}_{\lambda V}$ is the pullback by the operator that acts on $\mathcal{E}[[\lambda]]$ as

$$\tilde{\mathtt{r}}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) = \varphi + \lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\varphi) \tag{30}$$

Rearranging this gives an equation satisfied by the inverse map,

$$\tilde{\mathtt{r}}_{\lambda V}(\varphi) = \varphi - \lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0} V^{(1)}(\tilde{\mathtt{r}}_{\lambda V}(\varphi)) \,,$$

which is the Yang-Feldmann equation, and so by Lemma 3.1, $\tilde{\mathtt{r}}_{\lambda V} = \mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}$. □

Definition 5.2. Let $\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}$ denote the interacting product on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar, \lambda]]$ in the identification given by $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$, i.e.,

$$F \star_{0,\mathrm{int}} G \doteq \mathcal{Q}^{-1}_{\mathrm{Weyl}} \left(\mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{Weyl}} F \bullet_{\mathrm{int}} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathrm{Weyl}} G\right) = R^{-1}_{\lambda V}(R_{\lambda V} F \star_0 R_{\lambda V} G) \,.$$

Denote the $\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}$-commutator by

$$[F, G]_{\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}} = F \star_{0,\mathrm{int}} G - G \star_{0,\mathrm{int}} F \,.$$

It is now easy to see that the theory defined by $\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}$ is indeed a quantization of the classical theory defined by the Poisson bracket $\lfloor \cdot\,,\,\cdot \rfloor_{S_0+\lambda V}$ given in Definition 3.7.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $F, G, V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, then*

$$\frac{1}{i\hbar}[F,G]_{\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}}\Big|_{\hbar=0} = \lfloor F, G \rfloor_{S_0+\lambda V}\,,$$

thus $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar,\lambda]], \star_{0,\mathrm{int}})$ is a formal deformation quantization of $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\lambda]], \lfloor\cdot,\cdot\rfloor_{S_0+\lambda V})$.

Proof. This is a straightforward consequence of Propositions 3.1 and 5.2. The quantum Møller operator intertwines $\star_0$ with $\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}$ (by definition), so it intertwines their commutators. To first order in $\hbar$,

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\lambda V}\left([F,G]_{\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}}\right) &\approx R_{\lambda V}[F,G]_{\star_{0,\mathrm{int}}} = [R_{\lambda V}F, R_{\lambda V}G]_{\star_0} \\ &\approx i\hbar \lfloor r_{\lambda V}F, r_{\lambda V}G\rfloor_{S_0} = i\hbar\, r_{\lambda V}\lfloor F,G\rfloor_{S_0+\lambda V}\,. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 5.2. The equivalent, more abstract, statement is that for any $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}}$,

$$\mathcal{P}\left(\tfrac{1}{i\hbar}[A,B]_{\bullet_{\mathrm{int}}}\right) = \lfloor \mathcal{P}A, \mathcal{P}B\rfloor_{S_0+\lambda V}\,.$$

5.2 Graphical computations

Definition 5.3. $\mathcal{G}(n)$ is the set of isomorphism classes of directed graphs with n vertices labelled $1,\dots,n$ (and possibly unlabelled vertices with valency ≥ 1).

Also denote

$$\mathcal{G} \doteq \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{G}(n)\,.$$

We make $\mathcal{G}$ a category by defining a *morphism* $u : \alpha \to \beta$ to be a function that

- maps vertices of α to vertices of β and edges of α to edges or vertices of β,
- respects sources and targets of edges,
- maps labelled vertices to labelled vertices,
- and preserves the order of labelled vertices.

For $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$: $e(\gamma)$ is the number of edges; $v(\gamma)$ is the number of unlabelled vertices; $\mathrm{Aut}(\gamma)$ is the group of automorphisms.

Remark 5.3. This definition of morphism differs from the standard definition of a map of graphs [Mac98, Sec. II.7]. It is chosen to give the concept of extension that will be useful below. The meaning of isomorphism is the same.

Definition 5.4. A graph $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(n)$ determines an n-ary multidifferential operator, $\vec{\gamma}$, on functionals as follows:

- An edge represents $\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}(x,y)$ with the direction from y to x — i.e., such that this is only nonvanishing when the edge points from the past to the future;
- if the labelled vertex j has valency r, this represents the order r derivative of the j'th argument;
- likewise, an unlabelled vertex of valency r represents $V^{(r)}$.

Definition 5.5. In diagrams, $\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}$ will be denoted by a dashed line with an arrow, so all graphs in $\mathcal{G}$ will be drawn with dashed lines for the edges.

5.2.1 Non-interacting product

Definition 5.6. $\mathcal{G}_1(2) \subset \mathcal{G}(2)$ is the subset of graphs with no unlabelled vertices in which all edges go from 2 to 1.

In terms of these, the non-interacting product can be expressed as

$$F \star_{\mathcal{T}} G = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_1(2)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|} \vec{\gamma}(F,G). \tag{31}$$

Example 5.1. The $\hbar^3$ term is given by the graph



which is the unique graph in $\mathcal{G}_1(2)$ with 3 edges. Its automorphism group is S_3, which has order 6 and gives the correct coefficient, $\frac{1}{6}(-i\hbar)^3$.

5.2.2 Inverse Møller operator

Definition 5.7. $\mathcal{G}_2(1) \subset \mathcal{G}(1)$ is the set of graphs such that every edge goes from 1 to an unlabelled vertex.

Example 5.2.



$\in \mathcal{G}_2(1)$

has automorphism group $S_3 \times (\mathbb{Z}_2 \ltimes \mathbb{Z}_2^2)$.

Lemma 5.1.

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2(1)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)} \lambda^{v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}(\gamma)|} \vec{\gamma}(F) \tag{32}$$

Proof. Taking a Taylor expansion of V about φ in eq. (29) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} J(\varphi; w) &= \exp\left(\lambda \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{n-1}}{n!} \left\langle V^{(n)}(\varphi), (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)^{\otimes n} \right\rangle\right) \\ &= \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(\frac{\lambda(-i\hbar)^{n-1}}{n!} \left\langle V^{(n)}(\varphi), (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)^{\otimes n} \right\rangle\right) \\ &= \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{\lambda(-i\hbar)^{n-1}}{n!} \left\langle V^{(n)}(\varphi), (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)^{\otimes n} \right\rangle\right)^k \end{aligned}$$

The term $\left\langle V^{(n)}(\varphi), (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)^{\otimes n} \right\rangle$ gives the same differential operator as the graph with n edges directed from the vertex 1 to a single unlabelled vertex. We have here a sum over all possible products of such terms. This corresponds to all possible graphs in $\mathcal{G}_2(1)$.

The automorphisms of a graph $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2(1)$ do not permute the unlabelled vertices with different valencies, thus the automorphism group is a Cartesian product of the group of automorphisms for each of those subgraphs.

If γ has k unlabelled vertices of valency n, then an automorphism can permute each of those vertices, and for each such vertex, it can permute the n edges leading to it. That subgroup of automorphisms is thus a semidirect product of S_k and $(S_n)^k$. This has order $k!(n!)^k$. □

5.2.3 Composition of operators

The following is analogous to the concept of an extension of groups.

Definition 5.8. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(n)$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m)$, an *extension* of γ by α at $j \in \gamma$ is a pair of an injective and a surjective morphism

$$\alpha \overset{u}{\hookrightarrow} \beta \overset{v}{\twoheadrightarrow} \gamma$$

with $\beta \in \mathcal{G}(n+m-1)$, such that $u(\alpha) = v^{-1}(j)$, and the restriction of v to the compliment of $u(\alpha)$ is injective.

Two extensions are *equivalent* if there exists a commutative diagram between them with the identity on α and γ, and an automorphism on β.

Example 5.3. There is an extension



which maps the first graph to the bottom edge of the second graph, and then collapses that subgraph to the vertex 1 of the third graph.

Definition 5.9. The *partial composition* of multilinear maps is denoted by $\circ_j$ and means the composition of one map into the j'th argument of another.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{G}(n)$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(m)$ and $j = 1, \ldots, m$. The partial composition at j is*

$$\vec{\gamma} \circ_j \vec{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha \hookrightarrow \beta \twoheadrightarrow \gamma} \vec{\beta}$$

where the sum is over equivalence classes of extensions of γ by α at j.

Equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma||\mathrm{Aut}\,\alpha|} \vec{\gamma} \circ_j \vec{\alpha} = \sum_{\exists\, \alpha \hookrightarrow \beta \twoheadrightarrow \gamma} \frac{d_\beta}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\beta|} \vec{\beta}$$

where the sum is over the set of $\beta \in \mathcal{G}(n+m-1)$ such that there exists such an extension of γ by α at j, and d_β is the number of subgraphs of β isomorphic to α such that the quotient is isomorphic to γ with the subgraph mapped to j.

Proof. The composition $\gamma \circ_j \alpha$ can be thought of as inserting α in place of $j \in \gamma$. If r is the valency of $j \in \gamma$, then this is taking an order r derivative of $\vec{\alpha}$. The edges represent $\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0}$, which is constant, so the product rule tells us that this derivative is given by a sum over all possible ways of attaching the r edges to vertices of α (instead of to $j \in \gamma$). Any such attachment gives a graph β with a subgraph identified with α and the quotient identified with γ. This gives precisely the set of equivalence classes of extensions as defined above.

For the second expression, we need to write this as a sum over the graphs β that can appear as extensions, but one graph can appear in inequivalent extensions, so we need to understand the number of extensions with a given β.

An extension $\alpha \hookrightarrow \beta \twoheadrightarrow \gamma$ certainly determines a subgraph of β that is isomorphic to α. If two extensions determine the same subgraph, then it is easy to construct an automorphism of β that gives an equivalence between the extensions. (All of the edges of β are either in the subgraph or map to edges of γ.) So, having the same subgraph is a stronger equivalence than equivalence of extensions.

By definition, d_β is the number of possible images of α in extensions. Any two extensions with the same image are related by an automorphism of α and an automorphism of γ, therefore the number of extensions is

$$d_\beta |\mathrm{Aut}\,\alpha||\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma| \,.$$

An equivalence of extensions is always given by an automorphism of β, so an equivalence class consists of $|\mathrm{Aut}\,\beta|$ extensions, therefore the number of equivalence classes of extensions is

$$\frac{d_\beta |\mathrm{Aut}\,\alpha||\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\beta|} \,. \qquad \square$$

Example 5.4.



because the last graph occurs in two inequivalent extensions.

Example 5.5.



Each of these graphs has trivial automorphism group, except for the last, for which it has order 2. However, there are also 2 ways of mapping into it to give the quotient . This is why the coefficient of that term is also 1.

5.2.4 Interacting product

Definition 5.10. $\mathcal{G}_2(2) \subset \mathcal{G}(2)$ is the subset of graphs such that every edge either goes from a labelled vertex to an unlabelled vertex or from 2 to 1.

Lemma 5.3.

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F \star_{\mathcal{T}} G) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2(2)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)}\lambda^{v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}(\gamma)|}\vec{\gamma}(F,G)$$

Proof. This follows by inserting eq. (31) into eq. (32) and using the product rule. □

Definition 5.11. $\mathcal{G}_3(n) \subset \mathcal{G}(n)$ is the set of graphs such that:

- Every unlabelled vertex has at least one ingoing edge and one outgoing edge;
- there are no directed cycles;
- for $1 \leq j < k \leq n$, there does not exist any directed path from j to k.

In particular, this implies that 1 is a sink (has only ingoing edges) and n is a source (has only outgoing edges).

Definition 5.12.

$$F \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} G \doteq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_3(2)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)}(-\lambda)^{v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}(\gamma)|}\vec{\gamma}(F,G) \tag{33}$$

Remark 5.4. The only differences between this and the previous formula are that $\mathcal{G}_3$ has replaced $\mathcal{G}_2$ and λ has become $-\lambda$.

Definition 5.13. $\mathcal{G}_4(2) \subset \mathcal{G}(2)$ is the set of graphs obtained by extending graphs in $\mathcal{G}_3(2)$ by graphs in $\mathcal{G}_2(1)$ at 1 and 2.

Theorem 5.1.

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G) = \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F \star_{\mathcal{T}} G)\,,$$

thus $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ *is equivalent to the interacting product as*

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(F \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} G) = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(A) \bullet_{\mathrm{int}} \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}(B)\,,$$

justifying the notation.

Proof. Note that $\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)$ can be computed as some sum over $\mathcal{G}_4(2)$.

We first need to check that $\mathcal{G}_2(2) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_4(2)$, so suppose that $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2(2)$. By definition, all edges of γ either go from 1 or 2 to an unlabelled vertex or from 2 to 1. Let $\alpha \subset \gamma$ be the subgraph of edges from 1 (to unlabelled vertices) and denote the quotient graph as γ/α. Let $\beta \subset \gamma$ be the subgraph of edges going from 2 to (unlabelled) vertices not in α. All other edges of γ must go from 2 to vertices of α, therefore

$$(\gamma/\alpha)/\beta \in \mathcal{G}_1(2) \subset \mathcal{G}_3(2)$$

and so $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_4(2)$.

Eqs. (33) and (32) give

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta \in \mathcal{G}_2(1)} \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{G}_3(2)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e-v}(-1)^{v(\delta)}\lambda^{v}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\alpha||\mathrm{Aut}\,\beta||\mathrm{Aut}\,\delta|}\vec{\delta}(\vec{\alpha}F, \vec{\beta}G)$$

where $e = e(\alpha) + e(\beta) + e(\delta)$ and $v = v(\alpha) + v(\beta) + v(\delta)$. Applying Lemma 5.2, this becomes

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_4(2)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)} \lambda^{v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|} \vec{\gamma}(F,G) \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (-1)^{v(\gamma)-v(\alpha)-v(\beta)},$$

where the last sum is over $\alpha, \beta \subset \gamma$, such that $1 \in \alpha$, $2 \in \beta$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{G}_2(1)$, and $(\gamma/\alpha)/\beta \in \mathcal{G}_3(2)$.

Note that $\alpha \subset \gamma$ is the subgraph of all edges outgoing from $1 \in \gamma$, so it is uniquely determined by γ. On the other hand, although β must contain all edges from 2 to sinks that are not in α, it *may* contain any edge that goes from 2 to any other unlabelled vertex not in α (see Example 5.6). The sum over β is over the binary choices of including or not including each of these edges, thus

$$\sum_{\beta} (-1)^{v(\beta)} = 0$$

if there are any such edges. This reduces the expression for $\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)$ to a sum over γ without any such edges.

We are therefore interested in graphs $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_4(2)$ that do not contain any such ambiguous edge. This means that any edge from $2 \in \gamma$ must go to a vertex of $\alpha \subset \gamma$ or to a sink. By the definition of $\mathcal{G}_4$, $1 \in \gamma/\alpha$ is a sink, so any vertex of $\alpha \subset \gamma$ other than 1 is a sink. In short, any edge from $2 \in \gamma$ must go to 1 or a sink. This implies that all unlabelled vertices are sinks, and so any edge goes from 1 or 2 to an unlabelled vertex or from 2 to 1. In other words, $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2(2)$. In that case, all vertices of γ are in α or β, so $v(\gamma) = v(\alpha) + v(\beta)$. Therefore,

$$\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2(2)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)} \lambda^{v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|} \vec{\gamma}(F,G)\,.$$

With Lemma 5.3, this completes the proof. □

Example 5.6. Consider the graph

$\gamma =$ 

$\in \mathcal{G}_4(2)\,.$

The subgraph α consists of the edges labelled (a) here (and the adjacent vertices). The edge (b) must be in the subgraph β, but the edge (c) may or may not be in β. The other edges cannot be in β. The sum over the 2 possible choices of β with or without (c) gives 0, so that γ does not contribute to the formula for $\bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(F) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \bar{R}^{-1}_{\lambda V}(G)$.

5.3 Nonperturbative expression for an interacting product

Definition 5.14. For $S = S_0 + \lambda V$, with λ a formal parameter,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} &\doteq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-\lambda)^n \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}} \left(V^{(2)} \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)^n \\ &= \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}} - \lambda \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}} V^{(2)} \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}} + \lambda^2 \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}} V^{(2)} \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}} V^{(2)} \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}} - \dots \,.\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

This notation is justified by the fact that if $V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ then Δ_S^{A} is just the advanced propagator.

Definition 5.15. $\mathcal{G}_5(n)$ is the set of isomorphism classes of directed graphs with labelled vertices $1, \dots, n$ such that:

- Each unlabelled vertex has valency **at least 3** and is neither a source nor a sink;
- there exist no directed cycles;
- for $1 \leq j < k \leq n$, there does not exist a directed path from j to k.

Also define

$$\mathcal{G}_5 \doteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{G}_5(n) \,.$$

Definition 5.16. A graph $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_5(n)$ defines an n-ary multidifferential operator, $\vec{\gamma}$, as follows:

- An edge represents Δ_S^{A}.
- The labelled vertex j represents a derivative of the j'th argument.
- An unlabelled vertex represents a variational derivative of S.

Definition 5.17. In our diagrams, Δ_S^{A} will be denoted by a solid line with an arrow. For this reason, graphs in $\mathcal{G}_5$ will be drawn with solid lines for the edges. (This helps to distinguish $\mathcal{G}_5$ from $\mathcal{G}$.)

Remark 5.5. $S^{(2)}$ is the linearized equation of motion operator, thus $S^{(2)}\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}$ is the identity operator. This means that if there were a bivalent vertex in γ, then $\vec{\gamma}$ would be the same as if that vertex were removed, i.e.,

For this reason, $\mathcal{G}_5(n)$ can (and should) be thought of as a quotient of $\mathcal{G}_3(n)$. This leads to the appropriate definition of morphisms.

Definition 5.18. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{G}_5$, a *morphism* $u : \alpha \to \beta$ is a function that

- maps vertices of α to vertices of β and edges of α to **directed paths** in β,
- respects sources and targets of edges,

- maps labelled vertices to labelled vertices,
- and preserves the order of labelled vertices.

The concept of an extension in $\mathcal{G}_5$ follows from this definition.

Theorem 5.2. *For $S = S_0 + \lambda V$,*

$$F \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} G = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_5(2)} \frac{(-1)^{v(\gamma)}(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|} \vec{\vec{\gamma}}(F,G)\,. \tag{35}$$

Proof. For $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_5(n)$, the operator $\vec{\vec{\gamma}}$ can be expressed as a sum of operators given by graphs in $\mathcal{G}_3(n)$, with the following dictionary:

- Because any unlabeled vertex in γ has valency at least 3 (say, r), $S^{(r)} = \lambda V^{(r)}$, so this vertex corresponds to a vertex in $\mathcal{G}_4$ and a factor of λ.
- An edge in γ corresponds to a sum over all possible chains of edges and bivalent vertices in $\mathcal{G}_4$, with a factor of $-\lambda$ for every vertex, i.e.,



Adding bivalent vertices along edges of graphs in $\mathcal{G}_5(n)$ will give all graphs in $\mathcal{G}_3(n)$.

Applying this dictionary to (35) gives (33). □

Proposition 5.4. *If either*

- *$S = S_0 + \lambda V$, with λ a formal parameter and $V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$, or*
- *S is a local action such that $S^{(2)}(\varphi)$ induces a hyperbolic differential operator for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}$*

then

$$\left(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}\right)^{(1)} = -\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} S^{(3)} \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}\,. \tag{36}$$

Proof. In the first case, differentiating eq. (34) gives

$$\left(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}\right)^{(1)} = -\lambda \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} V^{(3)} \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} = -\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} S^{(3)} \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}\,.$$

In the second case, Δ_S^{A} is defined by its support property and the conditions that $S^{(2)}\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} S^{(2)}$ equal the identity operator. Differentiating the first expression gives

$$0 = S^{(3)}\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} + S^{(2)}(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}})^{(1)}\,,$$

and multiplying on the left by Δ_S^{A} gives

$$0 = \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} S^{(3)} \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} + (\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}})^{(1)}\,.$$

□

Theorem 5.1 shows that eq. (35) gives the interacting product for a free action plus a regular perturbation (up to time ordering). This implies in particular that the product is associative. It is worth understanding why it is associative in greater generality.

Theorem 5.3. *If S is an action functional and Δ_S^{A} satisfies eq. (36) then eq. (35) defines an associative product.*

Proof. Taking eq. (35) as the definition of $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$, we would first like to compute $(F_1 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_2) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_3$.

To compute this, first observe that for $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathcal{G}_5(2)$,

$$\vec{\gamma} \circ_1 \vec{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha \hookrightarrow \beta \twoheadrightarrow \gamma} (-1)^{v(\alpha)-v(\beta)+v(\gamma)} \vec{\beta}$$

where the sum is over equivalence classes of extensions at 1. These are precisely the ways of breaking up $1 \in \gamma$ and attaching the edges to α (possibly by adding new vertices) to form a graph β.

The axioms of $\mathcal{G}_5$ imply that there exists a partial order, $\preceq$, on the vertices of $\beta \in \mathcal{G}_5(3)$ that is generated by the edges and $1 \succ 2 \succ 3$.

This preimage of $1 \in \gamma$ is completely determined by the structure of β alone. It is the complete subgraph whose vertices satisfy $\succeq 2$. For this reason, $d_\beta = 1$ in the sense of Lemma 5.2. The number of equivalence classes of extensions is thus

$$\frac{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\alpha||\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\beta|}\,.$$

This uniqueness shows that any β can only appear in one term of the expansion of $(F_1 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_2) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_3$. Conversely, any $\beta \in \mathcal{G}_5(3)$ does occur in this expansion.

Together, this shows that

$$(F_1 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_2) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_3 = \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{G}_5(3)} \frac{(-1)^{v(\beta)}(-i\hbar)^{e(\beta)-v(\beta)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\beta|} \vec{\beta}(F_1, F_2, F_3)\,. \tag{37}$$

An essentially identical calculation (using the subgraph determined by $\preceq 2$) shows that $F_1 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} (F_2 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_3)$ is given by the same formula. □

Example 5.7. Consider the graph



$\in \mathcal{G}_5(3)\,.$

This occurs in a unique extension at 1,



corresponding to a term in $(F_1 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_2) \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_3$, and in a unique extension at 2



corresponding to a term in $F_1 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} (F_2 \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} F_3)$.

Remark 5.6. We have not proven that eq. (35) gives the correct interacting product for a local action. However, Theorem 5.3 makes this a plausible conjecture.

5.3.1 Low order terms

Explicitly, the product $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ is given up to order $\hbar^3$ as

$$m_{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} = m + \hbar B_1^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} + \hbar^2 B_2^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} + \hbar^3 B_3^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} + \dots$$

where

$$B_1^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} = i \quad \text{(1)} \longleftarrow \text{(2)} \quad , \tag{38}$$

$$B_2^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} = \frac{-1}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \text{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \longleftarrow \circlearrowleft \text{(2)} - \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \longleftarrow \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} \ , \tag{39}$$

and

$$B_3^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} = \frac{i}{6} \quad \text{(1)} \rightleftarrows \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \text{(2)} + \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \text{(2)}$$

$$+ i \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{4} \quad \text{(1)} \rightleftarrows \text{(2)} + \frac{i}{4} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{6} \quad \text{(1)} \longleftarrow \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)}$$

$$+ \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} + \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - i \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)}$$

$$+ \frac{i}{4} \quad \text{(1)} \rightleftarrows \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{4} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \circlearrowleft \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{6} \quad \text{(1)} \longleftarrow \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)}$$

$$+ \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} + \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - i \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)}$$

$$+ \frac{i}{4} \quad \text{(1)} \rightleftarrows \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{4} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \circlearrowleft \text{(2)} + \frac{i}{6} \quad \text{(1)} \longleftarrow \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)}$$

$$- \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} + \frac{i}{2} \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)}$$

$$+ i \quad \text{(1)} \circlearrowleft \longleftarrow \text{(2)} - \frac{i}{4} \quad \text{(1)} \rightleftarrows \longleftarrow \text{(2)}$$

$$+\frac{i}{4}$$  . (40)

5.3.2 Is there a Kontsevich-type formula?

In his famous paper on deformation quantization [Kon03], Kontsevich presented a formula for constructing a $\star$-product from an arbitrary Poisson structure on a vector space. Every term is a polynomial in the Poisson structure and its derivatives. In that construction, B_1 is antisymmetric and proportional to the Poisson structure, so this can be thought of as constructing a $\star$-product from its first order term.

The first order term of $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ is Δ_S^{A}, which is not antisymmetric. This suggests a question. In analogy with Kontsevich's formula, can $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ be constructed from Δ_S^{A} and its functional derivatives?

To address this, we first need some notation. Kontsevich's formula uses a sum over graphs in which vertices represent the Poisson structure. In his graphs, every unlabelled vertex has 2 outgoing edges. Because Δ_S^{A} has no symmetry, in our generalization, it will be necessary to distinguish these as left and right edges.

Definition 5.19. A *K-graph* is a directed graph in which:

- There are labelled vertices 1 and 2, and possibly unlabelled vertices;
- every edge is labelled as "left" or "right";
- every unlabelled vertex has 2 outgoing edges, one left and one right.

As with other graphs that we have considered, a K-graph determines a bidifferential operator. The vertices 1 and 2 represent the arguments. The unlabelled vertices represent Δ_S^{A}. The edges represent derivatives.

In diagrams, these will be drawn with solid arrows on the right edges.

For example,

$$B_1^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} = i$$ $$= i$$.

(Equality means equality of operators.)

In general, the operator given by a K-graph can also be given by a sum of graphs in which edges represent Δ_S^{A} and vertices represent derivatives of S, but not *vice versa*. A K-graph in which each unlabelled vertex has at most one ingoing edge will give a single term; otherwise, it will give several terms.

The second order term can indeed be constructed in this way:

$$B_2^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}} = \frac{-1}{2}$$  $$-\frac{1}{2}$$  $$-\frac{1}{2}$$ 

$$-\frac{1}{2}$$  .

We can come fairly close to expressing $B_3^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}}$ in terms of K-graphs. The only problem is with terms in which the labeled vertices both have valency 1. We can nearly reproduce this part of $-iB_3^{\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}}$ as



This leaves a discrepancy of



(41)

Note that these two terms each have 4 unlabelled vertices. A K-graph at order $\hbar^3$ has precisely 3 unlabelled vertices and when it is translated at least one term has 3 or fewer unlabelled vertices. In order to express (41) as a combination of K-graphs, we must in particular find combinations of K-graphs in which terms with 3 or fewer unlabelled vertices cancel. A tedious search shows that those combinations cannot reproduce (41), and thus the third order term of $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ cannot be constructed from Δ_S^{A} and its derivatives.

5.3.3 Interacting product in the standard identification and renormalization

These calculations have used the identification of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar]]$ defined by the quantization map $Q_{\mathcal{T}}$. In order to compare results and to try to extend this to all of $\mathfrak{A}$, we need to use the identification defined by $\mathcal{Q}_H$.

An expression for the interacting product $\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}$ in that identification is obtained from $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ by

$$F \star_{H,\mathrm{int}} G = \mathcal{T}_H(\mathcal{T}_H^{-1}F \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} \mathcal{T}_H^{-1}G)$$

for $F, G \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}[[\hbar, \lambda]]$.

The next step is to extend the domain of definition of $\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}$ to local non-linear arguments. The first step is straightforward, since we can set $\mathcal{T}_H^{-1}F\big|_{\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}} = \mathrm{id}$, as is usually done in pAQFT. Two questions remain:

1. Is $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ well defined for local arguments?

2. Can $\mathcal{T}_H$ be meaningfully applied on the product $F \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} G$, where F and G are local?

The potential problem with addressing the first question is that the expansion of the product $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ in terms of Feynman diagrams contains loops involving the advanced propagator, and light-cone divergences could be present.

Another strategy to renormalize $\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}$ is to go back to the standard presentation of the product and expand in terms of graphs containing both Feynman propagators and the 2-point function.

Definition 5.20. $\mathcal{G}_6(n)$ is the set of isomorphism classes of graphs with directed and undirected edges and labelled vertices $1, \ldots, n$ such that:

- Each unlabeled vertex has valency at least 3, including at least one ingoing and one outgoing edge;
- there exist no directed cycles;
- for $1 \leq j < k \leq n$, there does not exist a directed path from j to k.

Definition 5.21. A graph $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_6(n)$ defines an n-ary multidifferential operator, $\overrightarrow{\gamma}$, as follows:

- A directed edge represents Δ_S^{A};
- an undirected edge represents $\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{F}}$;
- the vertex j represents a derivative of the j'th argument;
- an unlabelled vertex represents a derivative of S.

Remark 5.7. Note that the Feynman propagator $\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{F}} = \frac{i}{2}\left(\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{R}} + \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{A}}\right) + H$ is defined by the free action S_0 and the Hadamard distribution H. It has nothing to do with the full action S.

Lemma 5.4.

$$\mathcal{T}_H = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_6(1)} \frac{\hbar^{e(\gamma)}}{|\operatorname{Aut}\gamma|} \overrightarrow{\gamma}$$

Proof. $\mathcal{T}_H \doteq \alpha_{\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{F}}} = e^{\frac{\hbar}{2}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{F}}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{F}} \doteq \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{F}}}$ is the operator given by the graph

.

A graph in $\mathcal{G}_6(1)$ has no directed edges and no unlabelled vertices; it is just a bouquet of undirected loops. Consider the unique graph with $e(\gamma) = m$ loops. Because the functional derivative of $\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{F}}$ is 0, this graph gives the operator $\overrightarrow{\gamma} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{F}}^m$. Its automorphism group is $\operatorname{Aut}\gamma = S_m \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^m$. So,

$$\frac{\hbar^{e(\gamma)}}{|\operatorname{Aut}\gamma|}\overrightarrow{\gamma} = \frac{\hbar^m}{2^m m!}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{F}}^m\,. \qquad \square$$

Definition 5.22. $\mathcal{G}_7(n) \subset \mathcal{G}_6(n)$ is the subset of graphs with no loops at labelled vertices (i.e., no edge begins and ends at the same labelled vertex).

$\mathcal{G}_8(n) \subset \mathcal{G}_6(n)$ is the subset of graphs with no loops.

Theorem 5.4.

$$F \star_{H,\mathrm{int}} G = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_7(2)} \frac{(-1)^{v(\gamma)}(-i)^{d(\gamma)}\hbar^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|} \vec{\vec{\gamma}}(F,G) \tag{42}$$

where $d(\gamma)$ is the number of directed edges. If $V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$, then the sum can be taken over $\mathcal{G}_8(2)$.

Proof. First, observe that

$$\mathcal{T}_H(F \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} G) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_6(2)} \frac{(-1)^{v(\gamma)}(-i)^{d(\gamma)}\hbar^{e(\gamma)-v(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|} \vec{\vec{\gamma}}(F,G)\,.$$

Replacing F and G with $\mathcal{T}_H^{-1}F$ and $\mathcal{T}_H^{-1}G$ serves to cancel out all terms with loops at 1 or 2.

If $V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$, then $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{F}}(S) = 0$, so any loop at an unlabelled vertex gives 0. □

The effect of the construction of the interacting product is to modify $\star_{\mathcal{T}}$, but to leave the time-ordered product alone. Although we began with a perturbative construction using a free action S_0, it is only the time-ordered product that remembers S_0.

In the non-interacting product, $\star_H$, the first order term is given by the 2-point function $\Delta^+_{S_0}$. It is convenient to define the 2-point function for S from the analogous term in $\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}$. That is,

$$\Delta^+_S \doteq \Delta^{\mathrm{F}}_{S_0} - i\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_S\,.$$

The terms of $\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}$ can be rewritten using this. Assume that the interaction V contains derivatives of fields up to order one (no second or higher order derivatives). The principal symbol of the operator induced by $S^{(2)}$ at each point is the same as the principal symbol of $S_0^{(2)}$. Therefore, the singularity structure of Δ^+_S is the same as the singularity structure of $\Delta^+_{S_0}$.

Here, an edge with a single arrow denotes Δ^{A}_S, an edge with a double arrow denotes Δ^+_S, a dashed edge with no arrow denotes $\Delta^{\mathrm{F}}_{S_0}$, and vertices denote S. As a multiplication map, $m_{\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}} = m + \hbar B_1^{\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}} + \hbar^2 B_2^{\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}} + \ldots$, where

$B_1^{\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}} =$

and

$B_2^{\star_{H,\mathrm{int}}} =$ 

It is clear now that $B_2^{\star^{H,\mathrm{int}}}$ can be extended to a bilinear map on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}$, since the loops built from the 2-point function only are well defined (usual WF set argument of [Hör03]) and the loops containing only the Feynman propagators can be renormalized in the standard way (see for example [DFKR14] and references therein for details). We see that lightcone divergences do not occur, since there are no diagrams with loops containing one Feynman and one 2-point function.

Unfortunately, in higher order terms new types of divergences appear. For example, the graph



,

which contributes to the third order operator $B_3^{\star^{H,\mathrm{int}}}$, has lightcone divergences.

5.4 Perturbative Agreement

Consider the case that V is quadratic, so that $V^{(2)}(\varphi)$ is independent of φ, and higher derivatives vanish. In this case, Theorem 5.2 becomes:

Corollary 5.2. *If $V \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{reg}}$ is quadratic, then $\star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}}$ is the exponential product defined by $-i\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0+\lambda V}$.*

Proof. An unlabelled vertex of $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_5(2)$ has valency $r \geq 3$ and represents the derivative $S^{(r)}$, which vanishes because S is quadratic, therefore $\vec{\gamma} = 0$ unless γ has no unlabelled vertices. This means that eq. (35) simplifies to something like eq. (31):

$$F \star_{\mathcal{T},\mathrm{int}} G = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_1(2)} \frac{(-i\hbar)^{e(\gamma)}}{|\mathrm{Aut}\,\gamma|} \vec{\gamma}(F,G)\,. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 5.5. *If V is quadratic, then*

$$\bar{R}_{\lambda V} = \alpha_{\lambda\delta} \circ r_{\lambda V}\,, \tag{43}$$

and

$$R_{\lambda V} = \mathcal{T} \circ \alpha_{\lambda\delta} \circ r_{\lambda V} \circ \mathcal{T}^{-1} \tag{44}$$

where α is defined in Proposition 4.2, $r_{\lambda V}$ is the classical Møller operator, and

$$\delta = i(\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}_{S_0})^{\otimes 2} V^{(2)} = i$$

.

Proof. Because V is quadratic,

$$\begin{aligned} V(\varphi - i\hbar\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w) &= V(\varphi) - i\hbar \left\langle V^{(1)}(\varphi), \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w \right\rangle - \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \left\langle V^{(2)}, (\Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w)^{\otimes 2} \right\rangle \\ &= V(\varphi) - i\hbar \left\langle V^{(1)}(\varphi), \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w \right\rangle + \frac{i}{2}\hbar^2 \left\langle \delta, w^{\otimes 2} \right\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

In this way, eq. (29) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} J(\varphi; w) &= \exp\left(\left\langle \lambda V^{(1)}(\varphi), \Delta^{\mathrm{A}}_{S_0} w \right\rangle - \frac{\hbar\lambda}{2} \left\langle \delta, w^{\otimes 2} \right\rangle \right) \\ &= J_0(\varphi; w) \exp\left(-\frac{\hbar\lambda}{2} \left\langle \delta, w^{\otimes 2} \right\rangle \right) , \end{aligned}$$

or concisely, $J = J_0\, e^{-\hbar\lambda\delta/2}$.

Now, $(J_0(\varphi) \triangleright G)(\varphi) = (r_{\lambda V}^{-1} G)(\varphi)$, and $e^{-\hbar\lambda\delta/2} \triangleright G = \alpha_{-\lambda\delta} G$. This shows that $\bar{R}_{\lambda V}^{-1}(G) = r_{\lambda V}^{-1} \circ \alpha_{-\lambda\delta}(G)$. Inverting this gives eq. (43).

Equation (44) just follows from the relationship between $\mathfrak{Q}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}_{\text{Weyl}}$. □

For a quadratic interaction, the classical Møller map $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}[[\lambda]]$ is just a linear map, given by

$$\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V} = \left(\mathrm{id} + \lambda \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{R}} V^{(2)}\right)^{-1} = \Big(\mathrm{id} + \lambda$$  $$\Big)^{-1}$$

where $\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{R}} : \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{E}$ and $V^{(2)} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{D}$ are regarded as linear maps.

Definition 5.23. With the advanced propagator defined perturbatively by eq. (34), the retarded and Dirac propagators are

$$\Delta_S^{\mathrm{R}}(x, y) = \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}(y, x)$$

and

$$\Delta_S^{\mathrm{D}} = \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{R}} + \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}\right)$$

Theorem 5.5. *For V quadratic, the quantum Møller operator can be expressed in terms of the classical Møller operator as [DHP15]*

$$R_{\lambda V} = r_{\lambda V} \circ \alpha_{i(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{D}} - \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{D}})}\,. \tag{45}$$

Proof. The definition of Δ_S^{A} can be written as

$$\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} =$$  $$= \text{----}\leftarrow\text{----}\Big(\mathrm{id} + \lambda$$ $$\Big)^{-1}.$$

Pulling Δ_S^{A} back by $\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}^{-1}$ gives

$$(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}^{-1})^{\otimes 2}(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}}) = \Big(\mathrm{id} + \lambda$$ $$\Big)$$  $$\Big(\mathrm{id} + \lambda$$ $$\Big)$$

$$= \Big(\mathrm{id} + \lambda$$ $$\Big)$$

$$=$$ $$+ \lambda$$

$$= \Delta_S^{\mathrm{A}} - i\lambda\delta\,.$$

Likewise, $(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}^{-1})^{\otimes 2}(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{R}}) = \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{R}} - i\lambda\delta$.

This means that

$$(\mathtt{r}_{\lambda V}^{-1})^{\otimes 2}(\Delta_S^{\mathrm{D}}) - \Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{D}} = -i\lambda\delta\,.$$

Remembering that $\mathcal{T} = \alpha_{i\Delta_{S_0}^{\mathrm{D}}}$, this gives

$$r_{\lambda V} \circ \alpha_{i\Delta_S^{\mathrm{D}}} = \mathcal{T} \circ \alpha_{\lambda\delta} \circ r_{\lambda V}\,.$$

Equation (44) immediately becomes

$$R_{\lambda V} = r_{\lambda V} \circ \alpha_{i\Delta_S^{\mathrm{D}}} \circ \mathcal{T}^{-1}$$

and using the definition of $\mathcal{T}$ again gives eq. (45) □

6 Conclusions

In this paper we have derived an explicit formula for the deformation quantization of a general class of infinite dimensional Poisson manifolds. We have also shown that our formula differs from the one provided by Kontsevich for the finite dimensional case. Our results hold for a restricted class of functions on the manifold in question and in order to generalize these results, one needs to perform renormalization. We made a first step towards this goal, by showing that the interating star product can be renormalized up to the 2nd order in $\hbar$. For higher orders it is unclear how to deal with potential lightcone divergences. However, there are reasons to believe that these cancel out or reduce to pointlike divergences, possibly with the use of GLZ relations, analogously to [DF04]. We want to investigate this possibility in future research. We also want to see how the present results are compatible with the algebraic adiabatic limit [BDF09, FR16] and the general framework proposed in [Haw16].

References

[Bas64] A. Bastiani, *Applications différentiables et variétés différentiables de dimension infinie*, Journal d'Analyse mathématique **13** (1964), no. 1, 1–114.

[BDF09] R. Brunetti, M. Dütsch, and K. Fredenhagen, *Perturbative algebraic quantum field theory and the renormalization groups*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **13** (2009), no. 5, 1541–1599.

[BFF+78] F. Bayen, M. Flato, C. Fronsdal, A. Lichnerowicz, and D. Sternheimer, *Deformation theory and quantization. I. deformations of symplectic structures*, Annals of Physics **111** (1978), no. 1, 61–110.

[CK00] A. Connes and D. Kreimer, *Renormalization in quantum field theory and the Riemann-Hilbert problem I: the Hopf algebra structure of graphs and the main theorem*, Commun. Math. Phys. **210** (2000), no. 1, 249–273.

[DF01a] M. Dütsch and K. Fredenhagen, *Algebraic quantum field theory, perturbation theory, and the loop expansion*, Commun. Math. Phys. **219** (2001), no. 1, 5–30.

[DF01b] ———, *Perturbative algebraic field theory, and deformation quantization*, Mathematical Physics in Mathematics and Physics: Quantum and Operator Algebraic Aspects **30** (2001), 1–10.

[DF02] ———, *The master Ward identity and generalized Schwinger-Dyson equation in classical field theory*, arXiv.org **hep-th** (2002), no. 2, 275–314.

[DF04] ———, *Causal perturbation theory in terms of retarded products, and a proof of the Action Ward Identity*, Reviews in Mathematical Physics **16** (2004), no. 10, 1291–1348.

[DF07] ———, *Action Ward identity and the Stückelberg-Petermann renormalization group*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 251, pp. 113–123, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.

[DFKR14] M. Dütsch, K. Fredenhagen, K. J. Keller, and K. Rejzner, *Dimensional regularization in position space and a forest formula for Epstein-Glaser renormalization*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **55** (2014), no. 12, 122303.

[DHP15] N. Drago, T.-P. Hack, and N. Pinamonti, *The generalised principle of perturbative agreement and the thermal mass*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.02705 (2015).

[FR12a] K. Fredenhagen and K. Rejzner, *Batalin-Vilkovisky formalism in perturbative algebraic quantum field theory*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **317** (2012), no. 3, 697–725.

[FR12b] ———, *Batalin-Vilkovisky formalism in the functional approach to classical field theory*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **314** (2012), no. 1, 93–127.

[FR15] ———, *Perturbative construction of models of algebraic quantum field theory*, pp. 31–74, Springer International Publishing, 2015.

[FR16] ———, *QFT on curved spacetimes: axiomatic framework and examples*, J.Math.Phys. **57** (2016), 031101.

[Ger68] M. Gerstenhaber, *On the deformation of rings and algebras III*, Annals of Mathematics (1968), 1–34.

[Haa93] R. Haag, *Local quantum physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

[Ham82] R. S. Hamilton, *The inverse function theorem of Nash and Moser*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc **7** (1982), 65–222.

[Haw16] E. Hawkins, *A cohomological perspective on algebraic quantum field theory*, [arXiv:math-ph/1612.05161].

[HK64] R. Haag and D. Kastler, *An algebraic approach to quantum field theory*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **5** (1964), no. 7, 848–861.

[Hör03] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of the linear partial differential operators I: Distribution theory and Fourier analysis*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[Kel10] K. J. Keller, *Dimensional regularization in position space and a forest formula for regularized Epstein-Glaser renormalization*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Hamburg (2010), [arXiv:math-ph/1006.2148].

[Kon03] M. Kontsevich, *Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds, I*, Lett. Math. Phys. **66** (2003), 157–216.

[Mac98] S. MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, 2 ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 5, Springer, 1998.

[Mil84] J. Milnor, *Remarks on infinite-dimensional Lie groups*, 1984.

[MMOY07] Y. Maeda, N. Miyazaki, H. Omori, and A. Yoshioka, *Star exponential functions as two-valued elements*, vol. 232, pp. 483–492, Springer, 2007.

[Nee06] K. H. Neeb, *Monastir summer school. Infinite-dimensional Lie groups*, TU Darmstadt Preprint **2433** (2006).

[OS73] K. Osterwalder and R. Schrader, *Axioms for Euclidean Green's functions*, Communications in mathematical physics **31** (1973), no. 2, 83–112.

[Pei52] R. E. Peierls, *The commutation laws of relativistic field theory*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences **214** (1952), no. 1117, 143–157.

[Rad96] M. J. Radzikowski, *Micro-local approach to the Hadamard condition in quantum field theory on curved space-time*, Commun. Math. Phys. **179** (1996), 529–553.

[Rej11] K. Rejzner, *Fermionic fields in the functional approach to classical field theory*, Reviews in Mathematical Physics **23** (2011), no. 9, 1009–1033.

[Rej16] ———, *Perturbative Algebraic Quantum Field Theory. An introduction for Mathematicians*, Mathematical Physics Studies, Springer, 2016.

[SW00] R. F. Streater and A. S. Wightman, *PCT, spin and statistics, and all that*, Princeton University Press, 2000.

[Wal07] S. Waldmann, *Poisson-Geometrie und Deformationsquantisierung: Eine Einführung*, Springer-Verlag, 2007.